



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the mystery of their own lives. It is the true and sufficient conception of God, of God self-revealed in the Scriptures. The direction of the thought in the reading of the Bible is thus changed, and the preacher who so reads for himself will best teach by example this enlarged use of the Bible, and also make its teachings most impressive.

The latter part of Prof. Tucker's address, treating the application of Christianity to existing social conditions, while full of truth and power, do not lie within the STUDENT'S province. His words above presented in abstract are significant, ringing words. The question to-day presses more severely upon the minister who has caught the spirit of true Bible study than that of how it shall affect his pulpit work. Some say: we will wait until all is settled and approved. Then whom will you delegate to settle and approve these things? Can you conscientiously refuse to do your part of that important work? Moreover, is there no joy or crown in disseminating a better knowledge of divine truth? And as a matter of fact, things *are* essentially settled. Many matters of detail are still in dispute, but, as Prof. Tucker truly says, the results of biblical criticism are not in the form of a ledger account with each item—miracle, incident, teaching, in which debits and credits have been shifted to a greater or less degree. The result is a changed conception of the Bible as a whole—a reconstructed idea of its origin, character, contents, meaning, and significance. This new conception is already fixed and by the unanimity of the best and truest scholars it is approved. It devolves upon the ministry, both as a duty and as a privilege, to gain this for themselves, and to give it from the pulpit to those who are waiting eagerly for it in the pews and Sunday school room.

**The Lex Talionis.\*** This law has been recently represented as legalizing private revenge, and cited as an instance of the imperfection of the Mosaic code. But this is an entire mistake. The law (Ex. 20:24; Lev. 24:19f; Deut. 19:21) by no means authorized individual retaliation, the taking of the execution of justice into one's own hands. It is given among judicial statutes, and is so to be interpreted. It declared what the authorities should impose for the prevention of criminal offenses. The law is not peculiar to the Pentateuch; it is found among the Twelve Tables of Rome, that venerable monument of early jurisprudence. Nor is it consistent with other moral precepts of the Old Testament (Ex. 23:4; Lev. 19:27f; Prov. 25:21f), which enjoin neighborly love, forbearance and forgiveness. When Christ set aside the saying, "An eye for an eye," etc., he aimed at the gross error of those who were in his own time perverting the law by giving it a private interpretation, justifying personal revenge. It was no part of Christ's object, in the Sermon on the Mount, to correct the morality of the Mosaic law; but he did seek to expose and condemn the corrupt glosses fastened upon it by his degenerate countrymen.

Evidently Dr. Gladden, to whose discussion of the Lex Talionis (in his recent book entitled, "Who Wrote the Bible?"), reference seems here to be made, takes a different view from that of Dr. Chambers concerning the provision of the Mosaic Code. Before the Law can be understood, four questions need to be answered: (1) is there anything in the text or context to indicate whether the Law was individual or judicial? (2) what does the history show as regards its observance: was it in practice interpreted judicially or privately? (3) which character is the more in consonance with the other provisions of the Mosaic Code? what was Christ's attitude toward the Mosaic Code in general, and this Law in particular? Now of these four points, the first can receive no conclusive answer, which makes an answer to the second of supreme importance in determining the character of the Law. Moreover, the fourth point receives no adequate treatment. It may be said in general, that there has been and is a strong tendency to *gospelize* (a bad word, but intelligible) the Old Testament History. Thus the natural impression which the record would make is superseded by a forced view which wrests the historical facts to conform to a mold more

\* By Talbot W. Chambers, D. D., in N. Y. *Independent*, September 24, 1891.

or less Christian. It does not necessarily follow that private revenge is not Mosaic because it is unchristian. Legislative provisions which at one time are the most practical in effecting desired results may at another time be quite out of harmony or inadequate to the advanced condition of society. We greatly need to cultivate the *historic* view of Jewish history; it is only by this process that the Old Testament Scriptures can be vitalized and made to have an influence upon men.

---

**The Inerrancy of the Original Autograph.\*** In the current discussion as to the quality and extensiveness of Biblical inspiration, the question has narrowed itself down to this: Was the original manuscript absolutely correct or not? It is admitted on all hands that there are errors in our current copies of Scripture, though the most radical of biblioclasts does not allege that any fundamental truth is affected by them. But the people are grasping the fact that the question touching the inerrancy of the original document is of such vital importance that it marks the divisional line between loyalty and disloyalty to the truth of God. It is quite sufficient for all practical purposes to know that the original copy of the Scriptures was thus flawless. The veracity of God is cleared in this manner, and the Scriptures are vindicated from the scandal that they merely "contain" his word. The Scriptures would not be *God's written* Word unless they were quite free from error [originally, is meant].

Truly there are many views of Biblical Inspiration, and the discussion concerning it which now abounds in the religious press, yes in the secular press as well, brings some quaint theories to the light. But it is a little surprising to find so eminent a minister as Dr. Burrell in the possession of such a theory as the above, and still more surprising to find it set forth in the columns of the *N. Y. Independent*. Could the *Independent* have really supposed that it was contributing, in the publication of the article, to the solution of this vexed problem? The agitation of the question is of the first importance. It is by such thorough discussion that truth is developed and formulated, and the church now demands a consistent, intelligent, Christian theory of Biblical Inspiration. Let every sincere effort be made, through every channel, to work out such a theory. But why should the attention be distracted by such an impossible view as Dr. Burrell holds? How does it help us, who have only errant copies of them, to hold that the originals were absolutely perfect? If inerrancy is the condition of infallibility, where is the infallible Bible for present use? How do we know what changes from the originals mar or vitiate the Scriptures now in our possession? If it was necessary that the original copies should be inerrant, and so God made them thus, why was it not equally necessary that they should be thus preserved for the Church? Surely it was not because God was not able for it, but what purpose had he in permitting the degeneration of his Word? As a matter of fact, do the Scriptures claim for themselves, even originally, to have been so absolutely perfect? Or, further, is it necessary to assume—for it can be nothing but sheer assumption—is it necessary to *assume* such absolute inerrancy in the original autographs in order to "clear God's veracity" and "vindicate the Scriptures from the scandal of merely 'containing' his word?" Is Dr. Burrell's theory of any service in this earnest search for truth? No. The avenue of approach to a true view of Biblical Inspiration runs in quite another direction, and at a higher altitude. The problem does not now call for *apriori* theories in God's defense, nor for dogmatism, nor for a spirit of strife; but for candid thought, a scholarly perspective, sincere and thorough investigation, and, permeating all, a spirit of dignity and sweet reasonableness.

---

**Dr. Schurer on the Fourth Gospel.†** I believe that the external evidence

\* By David J. Burrell, D. D., in the *N. Y. Independent*, Sept. 24, 1891.

† By Prof. W. Sanday, D. D., in *Contemporary Review*, Oct. 1891, pps 529-544. Being a reply to the article entitled, "The Fourth Gospel," by Prof. Emil Schürer, D. D., in same magazine, Sept. 1891.